REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-5, and 7-10 have been amended. The amendments have made to provide antecedent bases for a few terms. The claims have also been amended to replace the phrase "characterized in that" with the preferred term, "wherein." Finally, claims 11 and 12 have been added. Support for new claims 11 and 12 can be found on page 2, line 38 of the application. Thus, claims 1-5, and 7-12 are now pending.

Objections to the Specification

The specification was objected to for lack of subject headings, and a few portions of the application in which the paper was illegible. The specification has been amended to provide priority information and include subject headings. In addition, the portions of the specification which were illegible because of smudges on the copy of the application have been provided. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully contends this objection has been rendered moot.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 3, 5, 7, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as indefinite. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 3 has been amended to further clarify that a portion of each wheel protrudes through an opening in the housing. Applicant respectfully contends that claim 3 adequately defines the invention, and the rejection of claim 3 should be withdrawn. Claim 7 involved a similar rejection. As claim 7 now depends from claim 3, the rejection of claim 7 on this basis has also been rendered moot.

Claim 5 was rejected for involving redundant limitations. The Applicant has removed the redundant portion of the claim and respectfully contends the claim satisfies 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Finally, claim 7 was rejected because the Examiner believed the sealing arrangement limitation was unclear or inconsistent. The Applicant has amended claim 7 to further clarify that the sealing arrangement provides at least a substantial seal between the two parts (2 and 4) and at least substantially encloses a portion of the wheel which protrudes through the opening of the

housing. The Applicant respectfully contends claim 7 sufficiently defines the invention and respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5, and 9-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Jonsson (U.S. Pat. No. 4,565,084). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 1 requires a reciprocating movement produced by a drive arrangement (3). This reciprocating movement enables the device of claim 1 to form the sheet metal.

Jonsson fails to teach the reciprocating movement required by claim 1. According to the Office Action, the drive motor (11) taught by Jonsson provides this reciprocating movement. However, nowhere does Jonsson teach that drive arrangement 11 is capable of providing a reciprocating movement. The drive motor (11) drives the wheels, however, Jonsson only teaches the movement of the device in one direction. (See the discussion regarding the operation of the device at Col. 3, ll. 43-64, and Figure 1). Moreover, there would be no motivation to modify the Jonsson device to provide reciprocating motion because it is unnecessary for forming of the metal sheet. Since Jonsson fails to teach a drive arrangement capable of producing reciprocating movement, the Applicant respectfully contends that Jonsson fails to anticipate claim 1.

Moreover, claim 1 requires a second part that is fixed to a stand. Claim 1 further requires a bearing arranged between the first and second parts. (See, e.g., Figs. 1 and 5). As illustrated in Figures 2 and 3, however, Jonsson teaches a bearing arranged between the first part and the sheet metal being formed, not between the first and second part. Moreover, this metal sheet is not fixed to the stand. For these reasons as well, Jonsson fails to anticipate claim 1.

Furthermore, claim 1 requires that the device have a running surface located on either the first or the second part. No such running surface is taught by Jonsson. The device taught by Jonsson runs along the metal itself, not on one of the two parts (2, 4).

Claim 1 further requires that this running surface define the reciprocating movement of the first part. The reciprocating movement of the device of claim 1 occurs while the sheet is being formed. In other words, it is the reciprocating movement that enables the claimed device to form the metal.

The device taught by Jonsson, however, moves down the sheet metal in an incremental fashion. The device stops and the hydraulic piston (23) extends, at which point the wheel is lifted off the metal sheet by the movement of the bars (14 and 15) and the piston (23). The wheels are not driven during the metal forming movement, rather, the motion created by the piston (23) of the Jonsson device forms the metal. Thus, the running surface of Jonsson (whether the support table (2) or the metal sheet being formed) does not define the reciprocating movement of the first part. For at least all of these reasons, Jonsson fails to anticipate claim 1.

Claims 2-5 and 7-12 all depend from claim 1. For at least the reason that they depend upon an allowable base claim, these claims are also in condition for an allowance.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in the form of a Notice of Allowance.

Date: 2/26/04

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

By: _____
John J. Gresens
Reg. No.: 33,112
JJG/TSW